



**Solicitation Information
January 2, 2014**

Addendum #1

RFP # 7543371

**TITLE: CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS EDIRECT CERTIFICATION &
SMARRT REVIEW ART II INITIATIVES PROJECT OVERSIGHT**

Submission Deadline: JANUARY 16, 2014 AT 11:30 AM

**PLEASE NOTE THAT THE SUBMISSION DEADLINE HAS BEEN EXTENDED
TO THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2014 AT 11:30 AM.**

**ATTACHED ARE VENDOR QUESTIONS WITH STATE RESPONSES. NO
FURTHER QUESTIONS WILL BE ANSWERED.**

**YOU MAY ACCESS .ZIP FILES BY CLICKING ON THE LETTER 'D' IN THE
COLUMN LABELED 'INFO.'**

**Gail Walsh
Chief Buyer**

1. Is there potential for one vendor to be selected to oversee and a separate one to develop? There are multiple similarities between the two RFP's and a need to understand the intent and vision.

RIDE Response: Historically, RIDE has issued two RFP's for new functionality to the CNP Connect Management Information System (CNP Connect). One of the RFP's is to act as the technical project manager (oversight) for the business analysis, the architectural designer and the overall implementation of the module. The Child Nutrition Program lacks the technical expertise to act as the oversight manager of this initiative. This position works closely with the RIDE Child Nutrition Program and the RIDE Office of Network and Information Systems.

The second RFP associated with this project is to contribute to the business analysis, to develop (code) and to implement (rollout) the new functionality. This vendor works closely with the oversight (project manager) vendor.

Yes, one vendor maybe selected for both RFP's if they are able to provide the services outlined in each RFP.

2. How do you envision that this project will be structured in the event that two separate vendors are selected for each of the RFP's (Development v Oversight)?

RIDE Response: Historically, these two RFP's have been awarded to separate vendors. However, RIDE is open to having one vendor person perform both functions.

3. Can one vendor be awarded one initiative (Direct Certification versus Administrative Review) within one RFP and not the other? Was there a technical reason that the two were combined in each of the RFP's or is it related to funding aspects within your organization?

RIDE Response: Within each of the RFP's are two distinct projects: The Direct Certification Project and the SMARRT Administrative Review Project. These two disparate projects are both MIS/ CNP Connect related and, therefore, posted within one RFP.

A separate vendor for each of these two projects may be selected, based on their ability to fulfill the requirements of the project's specifications.

4. If two separate vendors are selected for each of the RFP's, or for the separate initiatives within each RFP, will there be partnership agreements in place to protect the respective intellectual property rights of the selected vendors?

RIDE Response: This has not occurred in the past. It would have to be discussed further during contract negotiations.

5. It appears that many of the elements of the RFP's are similar, with the Oversight RFP including elements of architecture design, development and QA. How will it be determined which vendor is responsible for the various elements? Can you clarify the nature of the deliverables for "Oversight" versus "Development?"

RIDE Response: This is a design process which is lead by the oversight vendor (architect of the system), but involves close collaboration with the development/coding vendor. For example, both vendors are involved in the business analysis and design aspects of the work flow, the development (coding) is conducted by the development vendor.

Note that all work is done in close collaboration with the RIDE Child Nutrition Program administrator and RIDE content experts.

6. How will it be determined which aspect of the work will be applied to which RFP? For example, responsibility for training is identified in both.

RIDE Response: Each of the selected vendors participates in the training. The oversight manager develops the training materials (both paper and on-line content). Both the developer and the oversight manager provide User acceptance training and user training as each have content knowledge which needs to be transferred to the RIDE Child Nutrition Staff.

7. The RFP states that alternative approaches and/or methodologies to accomplish the desired or intended results of this procurement are solicited. Your RFP appears to be flexible with respect to the architecture of the desired system so long as defined functionality is met. Please indicate whether a COTS solution and substitute UI with interfaces between existing systems and COTS would be a viable approach. Or, are

enhancements to your existing proprietary implementation the specific approach you are looking for?

RIDE Response: As outlined in the RFP, RIDE is looking for a solution which best meets the specifications outlined in the RFP. While RIDE's CNP Connect has been custom designed and built by vendors, RIDE is interested in all potential solutions. If other solutions are proposed (COTS solution and substitute UI with interfaces between existing systems and COTS), the bidder should provide information on how this alternate solution would interface with our current functionality.

Note: Our current CNP Connect system was developed with USDA funds; it is not a proprietary system.

8. Was the current system built in house or was there an external contractor involved? If an external firm developed the system, can you identify the vendor so that we can reach out to them for additional information?

RIDE Response: The current CRE framework was designed, coded and implemented by two vendors:

Integra International (Joe Guido) – Project Manager
Web-Cow Inc (Bob Cowing) - Development/Coding

9. Can you identify an internal RIDE technical contact that can respond to requests for technical information? If so, please provide that information for our Chief Technologist?

RIDE Response: That information will be provided to the successful vendor(s). Vendors may not contact RIDE personnel.

10. Is there a requirement that the provider have experience in the functional areas of direct certification/verification and administrative reviews?

RIDE Response: As mentioned in the response to question #3, there is the potential that two separate vendors may be selected; one for the direct certification/verification functionality, and another for the SMART Administrative Review functionality. It is expected that the vendor will have experience in the relevant functional area if they are awarded the contract in one of these two disparate projects.

11. Is there a requirement that the vendor is familiar with the technical implementation of the existing system?

RIDE Response: Some of the specifications in this RFP do link to select aspects of our current CNP Connect MIS. It is unclear how the vendor would develop these linkages with a familiarity with these aspects of CNP Connect.

12. Can you identify what your existing technology stack is (for instance ASP.NET, SQL Server BI, including versions and editions)?

RIDE Response: Refer to Attachment 01A

13. Thank you for the workflow documents. May we also have access to technical specifications to properly estimate costs for linking modules to RIDE Connect?

RIDE Response: Refer to Attachments:

- 02A – CNP Connect CRE Quick Reference User Guide
- 02B – Findings Matrix User Guide
- 02C - CNP Connect CRE User Guide / Findings Matrix Appendix
- 02D - SMARRT Workflow Vision

14. In order to project the hours for each task identified, may we have the detailed requirements that you have developed thus far (understanding that not all requirements have been validated)?

RIDE Response: Details are contained within the RFP's and the Attachments provided.

15. How does one get access to the data map i.e. table names, file and field structures to relevant portions of RIDE Connect including examples of SIS formats, administrative management tools for agreements and claims, and financial systems (specifically, data models and service interface definitions)?

RIDE Response: Attached are the Data Map (ie, table names, file and field structure to relevant portion RIDE CNP Connect including example of SIS formats), Administrative Management tools for Agreement and Claims, and Financial Systems (specifically data models and service interface definitions).

- 03A – CNP Connect Database Tables Listing
- 03B – CNP Connect Organizational Table Columns

- 03C – CNP Connect Database Tables Listing
- 03D - CNP Connect Infrastructure Overview Schema
- 03E – CNP Connect Vision
- 03F – CNP eGateway Executive Summary
- 03G – RIDE CNP eGateway Security Description
- 03H – RIDE CNP eGateway Transparency Data Accuracy.Fiscal
Accountability.Sustainability Standards

16. Is there a User Guide or similar documentation that you can provide that includes and explanation of the overall functions of each component of the existing enterprise system?

RIDE Response: Attached are the user guides for CNP Connect.